

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 28, 2003

LB 48, 92

was the funding and the reinstitution, and you feel that, even though we're expanding it to include membership, that that would also be covered under that?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, because that original amendment had the language that would revive the commission, by reviving those statutes that LB 92 would have done away with. So everything in LB 48, as it stands now, in some form has been before the body.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Okay. Final question: The statement that you've made that if we do not pass LB 48 that the Rural Development Commission ceases to exist, and I would say that that's in statute, you're going to say that...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR ERDMAN: ...they're not going to receive the funding from the USDA if we don't do this.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm saying, first of all, that they definitely will be abolished as of July 1. There will be no council recognized by the federal government, and at that point perhaps the Governor's grant will be accepted because there is no other place for it to go. Right now the commission still exists.

SENATOR ERDMAN: And if I understand your earlier comments about politics, you seem to think that Senator Nelson and Governor Johanns, who are counting on the same money, won't be able to resolve this in their own way favorably?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's a question the answer to which I cannot give with precision.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Okay. I'm going to oppose LB 48. I don't disagree with Senator Chambers' intentions, but I also think that there is an opportunity for them to do what they have asked the body to do, and I think that the pressure that's been placed is one that I think...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.